

**SPACE SCIENCE EVALUATIONS, ASSESSMENTS, STUDIES,
SERVICES AND SUPPORT**

**CONTRACT NNL05AA01B
(Source Selection Statement)**

The deleted material is exempt from disclosure under 14 C.F.R. 1206.300(b)(4) which covers trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged and confidential information. It has been held that commercial or financial material is "confidential" for purposes of this exemption if its disclosure would be likely to have either of the following effects: (1) impair the Government's ability to obtain necessary information in the future; or (2) cause substantial harm to the competitive position of the person from whom the information was obtained, *National Parks and Conservation v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT
FOR SPACE SCIENCE EVALUATIONS, ASSESSMENTS, STUDIES, SERVICES
AND SUPPORT PROCUREMENT

On February 2, 2005, I reviewed the final Evaluation Report submitted by the NASA Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals for the Space Science Evaluations, Assessments, Studies, Services and Support procurement. The SEB presentation included the procurement history, the proposal evaluation procedures, the evaluation criteria, and the final proposal evaluation results.

PROCUREMENT HISTORY

This contract will provide services and support to the Langley Research Center's Science Support Office (SSO) and other Langley offices. The SSO supports the NASA Headquarters Office of Space Science (OSS), Office of Earth Science (OES) and other functional offices. Task orders will be issued under the contract for the contractor to:

- 1) conduct evaluation activities, to include preparing supplementary material to accompany Announcements of Opportunity (AOs), evaluating proposals submitted in response to NASA Research Announcements (NRAs), evaluating proposals submitted in response to Cooperative Agreement Notices (CANs) or other Broad Agency Announcements (BAAs), planning the logistics of the evaluations and identifying the expertise need for the evaluations;
- 2) conduct technical, management and cost assessments of current and potential NASA Programs; conduct management, scientific and technical studies; conduct quick studies and assessments;
- 3) provide information management services including, but not limited to, web-based information management systems, databases, reference documents, and website development and maintenance;
- 4) provide facilities and administrative support necessary to perform evaluations, assessments and studies.

The contract will be an indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity (IDIQ), cost plus fixed fee (CPFF) contract. The period of performance will be 60 months from the effective date of the contract.

Stages of Procurement and Dates

The Draft Request for Proposal (RFP) was released on June 3, 2004, and the final RFP was released on July 13, 2004, via the internet. One proposal was received on August 16, 2004, from the following offeror:

- Scientific Applications International Corporation, Technology Services Company (SAIC)

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104

The SEB presented the results of its initial findings to the contracting officer on December 10, 2004. On January 7, 2005, the SEB transmitted a letter with written questions and a request for Final Proposal Revisions (FPR) to the one offeror in the competitive range and responses were received on January 14, 2005.

Statement of Evaluation Criteria and Weights

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, the Source Selection Authority (SSA) appointed an SEB to conduct an evaluation of proposals received in response to the RFP. The RFP stated that the evaluation will be conducted in accordance with NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3. The RFP also stated that Mission Suitability will be scored; however, considering only one proposal was received, it was determined that scoring this factor was unnecessary. Cost and Past Performance will not be scored.

The RFP set forth the following three evaluation factors approved by the SSA:

- Factor 1 - Mission Suitability
- Factor 2 - Cost/Price Analysis
- Factor 3 - Past Performance

The RFP states that overall, in the selection of a contractor for contract award, the areas of Mission Suitability and Past Performance are of essentially equal importance with Cost being of lesser importance.

Upon receipt of the proposal, the SEB reviewed it to determine if it was acceptable to proceed with a complete evaluation. It was found to be acceptable by the SEB. Each member of the SEB performed a detailed, individual review of the offeror's Mission Suitability proposal, without having seen or evaluated the offeror's business proposal or its proposed price. Individual findings, stated in the form of individual strengths or weaknesses, were all recorded. Consultant findings were also recorded. No SEB member reviewed the findings of other members or consultants until the SEB met in caucus. In caucus and with all SEB voting members present, the SEB evaluated each individual finding, including the findings of consultants, to determine whether to carry the finding forward as a consensus finding. For any strength or weakness that was carried forward, the SEB determined by consensus whether it met the applicable definition of "significant." Once consensus Mission Suitability strengths and weaknesses were assigned for the one offeror, the SEB reviewed its findings to ensure that the established criteria for strengths and weaknesses, significant or otherwise, had been consistently applied. Consensus adjective ratings were then assigned for each Mission Suitability subfactor in accordance with Section M of the solicitation. As only one proposal was received in response to the solicitation, the offeror's Mission suitability subfactors were not numerically scored. Thereafter, the SEB analyzed the proposed prices, and evaluated and assigned adjective ratings to the one proposal for Past Performance. All consensus findings were incorporated into a final report and presented to the Contracting Officer. The Contracting Officer determined that discussions were necessary and declared and documented a Competitive Range.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104

The SEB performed a detailed evaluation of the final revised proposal following discussions, and presented the results of their findings to me on February 2, 2005. A narrative of the results are provided below:

FINDINGS NARRATIVE

Offeror	Mission Suitability Rating	Evaluated Price (Probable Cost)	Past Performance Rating
SAIC	Excellent		Excellent

Factor I: Mission Suitability

I carefully reviewed the findings of the SEB. Set forth below are the final Mission Suitability findings for the offeror:

Scientific Applications International Corporation (SAIC): Received an overall adjective rating of "Excellent" for this Factor. The offeror demonstrated a comprehensive and thorough understanding of the requirements and received numerous strengths (significant and otherwise) and only a minimal number of weaknesses were noted.

SAIC received an overall rating of "Excellent" for subfactor 1 under Mission Suitability, Understanding the Requirement.

For subfactor 1a., Understanding the Requirement - Proposal and Mission Concept Evaluations, significant strengths were associated with SAIC demonstrating an effective approach to performing and planning the logistics of proposal and mission concept evaluations covering technical, management, and cost factors and developing and maintaining an extensive roster of respected, experienced consultants and staff with diverse expertise covering the technical, management, and cost and other program factors. Strengths were associated with SAIC's use of an electronic repository and communication capabilities which provide cost-effective support of a geographically dispersed group of specialists; designing unique forms and data management tools to support the Technical, Management, and Cost (TMC) evaluation process; and having demonstrated the capability to plan and support the logistics of multiple, simultaneous evaluations of various programs and types. No weaknesses were noted for this subfactor.

For subfactor 1.b., Understanding the Requirement – Assessments, significant strengths were identified for SAIC's understanding of and effective approach to conducting assessments and having a large number (>100) of experienced consultants, with consulting agreements already in place to meet assessment requirements. Strengths were associated with SAIC's understanding of assessments as shown through their explanation of the broad range of requirements these assessments can have and the broad range of disciplines needed. No weaknesses were noted for this subfactor.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104

For subfactor 1.c., Understanding the Requirement – Cost Assessments, a significant strength was associated with SAIC's understanding of and approach to performing cost assessments and their introduction of several innovations which make cost assessments more reliable and easier to perform. One weakness noted for this subfactor was that the cost analysts operate as a separate team without clearly explaining how the cost risk rating is integrated with the overall risk rating for each proposal in an evaluation.

For subfactor 1.d., Understanding the Requirement – Management, Scientific and Technical Studies, a significant strength was identified for SAIC's demonstrated understanding and effective approach to conducting these studies. One weakness noted in this subfactor was that the offeror failed to address how they would identify the expertise needed for the studies.

For subfactor 1.e., Understanding the Requirement – Administrative Support, significant strengths were associated with SAIC having secured multiple suitable facilities [REDACTED] near Langley Research Center with backups available/accessible in the Washington, D.C. area; the offeror providing internet access augmented by dedicated SAIC equipment; [REDACTED] which brings significant expertise in supporting meetings including generating and distributing materials and providing logistical support. No weaknesses were noted for this subfactor.

For subfactor 1.f., Understanding the Requirement – Information Management Services, strengths were associated with SAIC's proposed Remote Evaluation System (RES) capability to increase the number of projects with little or no re-design; and the approach to expand and maintain the Spacecraft and Instrument Database. No weaknesses were noted for this subfactor.

For subfactor 1.g., Understanding the Requirement – Sample Task Plans, significant strengths were associated with SAIC's proposed approach for distributing proposals as early as possible to get proposals in the hands of the evaluators as soon as possible; the excellent schedule layout to review the proposals and the reduced amount of time experts will need to complete evaluations when using a secure website for data exchange; the realistic time schedule for meeting time-critical events; and the economical approach of using commercial software in the performance of tasks. The three weaknesses identified for this subfactor were that SAIC did not provide a complete breakout of the proposed travel costs for any sample tasks; the offeror stated they would provide a schedule reviewer for sample task 1 but failed to include the labor category in their staffing matrix; and two of the proposed employees for sample task 2 were assigned to incorrect task roles.

SAIC received an overall rating of "Excellent" for subfactor 2 under Mission Suitability, Management and Operations.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104

For subfactor 2.a., Mission Suitability, Management and Operations – Protection of Data, a significant strength was identified as the proposed approach ensures that effective procedures will be used to provide sufficient protection to restrict access to source selection material in web-based information management systems, databases and facilities. One weakness was noted under this subfactor as the potential risk of protection of proprietary data was not discussed in the offeror's proposal.

For subfactor 2.b., Management and Operations - Quick Studies and Assessments, a significant strength was associated with SAIC having the capability and the assets to perform quick studies and assessments, based on the offeror having a large number of consultant agreements in place and also having umbrella contractual mechanisms in place. Strengths were cited for SAIC's effective approach for addressing the primary challenges associated with quick studies and assessments, and SAIC's assignment of a study manager to each quick response task order. No weaknesses were noted for this subfactor.

For subfactor 2.c., Management and Operations - Managing the Total Contract and Individual Orders, significant strengths were associated with SAIC's proposed excellent organizational structure for managing and implementing this effort; and their proposed efficient approach for organizing, assigning, tracking, performing and controlling the work flow. No weaknesses were noted for this subfactor.

For subfactor 2.d., Management and Operations - Teaming Arrangements, a significant strength was identified for SAIC's approach of providing a substantial list of pre-qualified subcontractors to support this effort. No weaknesses were noted for this subfactor.

For subfactor 2.e., Management and Operations - Preparation and Submission of Complete Task Plans, a significant strength was associated with SAIC's development of tailored templates and heuristics to facilitate the task plan process. Strengths were noted for SAIC's proposed approach of initiating an Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan at the start of task performance, and SAIC's good approach for using COMeT as a contract management tool. No weaknesses were noted for this subfactor.

For subfactor 2.f., Management and Operations -Approach for Contract Cost Control, a significant strength was associated with SAIC's demonstration of a significant understanding of the control problem generated by the lag in invoicing and requiring the Study Managers to be responsible for and actively involved in cost monitoring and cost forecasting. A strength was associated with SAIC's proposed enhancements to improve the process of cost control. A weakness was also noted, as there is not much leverage in SAIC's proposed mechanisms for mitigating a cost overrun.

For subfactor 2.g., Management and Operations - Avoiding Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI), Protecting Sensitive and Proprietary Information, and Export Control, significant strengths were associated with SAIC's proposal which outlines a strong company-wide, formalized approach for OCI management, and also proposes a strong

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104

OCI training program to educate its employees. Strengths were identified for SAIC's effective proposed approach for ensuring the protection of sensitive and proprietary information and also having effective internal policies and procedures. No weaknesses were noted for this subfactor.

For subfactor 2.h., Management and Operations - Small Business Subcontracting Plan, a significant strength was associated with SAIC's proposed small business subcontracting plan which exceeded the goals stated in the RFP. A strength was identified for the comprehensiveness of SAIC's proposed small business subcontracting plan. No weaknesses were noted for this subfactor.

SAIC received an overall rating of "Excellent for Subfactor 3, Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Participation. For subfactor 3, a significant strength was associated with SAIC's proposed participation of SDB concerns in the NAICS Industry Subsector of 541710 which exceeds the RFP requirement of 5%. Several other strengths were cited for SAIC's attention to SDB concerns. No weaknesses were noted for this subfactor.

SAIC received an overall rating of "Excellent" for subfactor 4, Safety and Health Plan. For subfactor 4, a significant strength was associated with SAIC's proposed approach for providing a comprehensive safety and health policy which includes involvement by all employees and team members. No weaknesses were noted for this subfactor.

Factor II: Cost/Price

The one proposal, including subcontractors, was reviewed for the purpose of evaluating price reasonableness and cost realism and to establish probable cost. Input from the SEB, Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), and a price analyst were used to determine cost realism and to establish the probable cost. Although the solicitation was issued as full and open competition, only one proposal was received. Pursuant to FAR 15.404-1(b)(2)(ii) normal comparison to the incumbent's contract to determine price reasonableness cannot be applied in this procurement as quantities used to establish a "proposed price" were Government provided estimates and not related to the incumbent's contract. This comparison would not be realistic. Therefore, price reasonableness is established based on adequate price competition pursuant to FAR 15.403-1(c)(1)(ii). In addition, reasonableness is established based on the analysis of the pricing information provided by the offeror pursuant to FAR 15.404-1(b)(2)(vii).

The following summarizes the initial cost evaluation for the CPFF effort for the prime and the subcontractors.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104

COST REALISM ANALYSIS (PRIME)			
Offeror	Proposed Price	Probable Cost	Confidence Level
SAIC			Moderate

COST REALISM ANALYSIS (Subcontractors)		
Offeror	Proposed Price	Probable Cost
		No Adjustment
		No Adjustment
		No Adjustment

Based on the analysis of the proposal and the adjustments addressed, the derived probable cost of [REDACTED] is determined to be realistic for SAIC's approach to achieving the technical objectives.

Factor III: Past Performance

SAIC received an overall adjective rating of "Excellent" for this factor. SAIC and their proposed subcontractors received customer ratings ranging from Satisfactory to Excellent with the majority of performance ratings being Excellent. Both SAIC and their proposed subcontractors submitted information on contracts where the majority of experience indicated a high level of relevant past performance. SAIC has been the incumbent contractor for these services at Langley Research Center for the past ten years.

SOURCE SELECTION DECISION

After examining the SEB's final evaluation report, I reviewed and assessed the evaluation findings. In the Mission Suitability factor, I find that SAIC's proposal provides an excellent assurance of successful contract performance because their proposal demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirements and comprehensive capabilities for meeting the requirements. This is reflected in their Mission Suitability rating of Excellent. Cost realism analysis of SAIC's proposed price of [REDACTED] resulted in a probable cost of [REDACTED], for a difference of .005%. Moreover, SAIC demonstrated highly relevant experience and excellent past performance, which is reflected in their rating of Excellent in the past performance factor.

Based on my integrated assessment of these facts as noted above, I have concluded that SAIC is selected for award. I have considered the areas of Mission Suitability, Cost/Price and Past Performance, with Mission Suitability and Past Performance being of essentially equal importance and Cost being of lesser importance. The offeror represents substantial

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104

substantial value to the Government and will bring unique talents to NASA that will assist NASA significantly in meeting mission requirements.

I am convinced that the SEB conducted a thorough, fair, and objective evaluation of the proposal in accordance with the established Evaluation Criteria. Accordingly, I direct that award be made to SAIC.


Roy D. Bridges
Source Selection Authority

2-11-2005
Date